

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 4 are present in this application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2 to 4 are allowable.

§ 102(b) Rejection – Price

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,690,072 (Price). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Summary of the Present Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention is directed to a grinding method that seeks to shorten time to reach a set grinding pressing load (preparation time) by allowing movement by an amount of overshoot that is within an acceptable range. (see page 11, with respect to Fig. 4).

Embodiments of the present invention covered by claim 1 are directed to an on-line grinding method where a forward velocity of the rotating grinding wheel is reduced to decrease an overshoot by which the pressing load of the rotating grinding wheel on the work roll exceeds the set grinding pressing load F_0 . In other words, in the present claimed invention, the pressing load of the grinding wheel exceeds the set grinding pressing load, enabling a faster preparation time.

Price is directed to an automatic taper compensator used to maintain a parallel relationship between the axis of a wide grinding wheel and the centerline of a cylindrical workpiece on a grinding machine. (Abstract)

The Office Action alleges that Price teaches that a grinding wheel is fed in a forward direction at a set velocity until contact with the work is made, and the forward velocity is then reduced.

Applicants submit that Price does not address the problem of reducing grinding preparation time. Subsequently, Applicants submit that even if it is true that Price teaches reduction in a forward velocity, Price still fails to teach or suggest reducing a forward velocity of the rotating grinding wheel "to decrease an overshoot by which the pressing load of the rotating grinding wheel on the work roll exceeds the set grinding pressing load F_0 ."

At least for this reason, Applicants submit that Price fails to teach each and every claimed feature. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert W. Downs # 48, 222

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant